



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,068	01/18/2001	Gregory Donoho	LEX-0119-USA	6755

24231 7590 07/03/2003

LEXICON GENETICS INCORPORATED
8800 TECHNOLOGY FOREST PLACE
THE WOODLANDS, TX 77381-1160

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

MONSHIPOURI, MARYAM

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1652

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2003

S

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/765,068	Applicant(s)	
	Donoho et al.	
	Examiner Maryam Monshipouri	Art Unit 1652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
- Disposition of Claims**
- 4) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 2 and 3 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

- 15) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 6&7
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

Art Unit: 1652

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-3 are under examination on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for isolated DNA molecules comprising SEQ ID NO:1, does not reasonably provide enablement for isolated DNA molecules comprising at least 24 contiguous bases of SEQ ID NO:1. Claim 1 as recited is directed to an enormous number of DNA sequences which need to only comprise 24 bases of SEQ ID NO:1 with no function.

The criteria for undue experimentation, summarized in *re Wands*, 8, USPQ2n 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988) are: 1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, 2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, 3) the presence and absence of working examples, 4) the nature of the invention, 5) the state of prior art, 6) the relative skill of those in the art, 7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and 8) the breadth of the claims.

Applicant is well aware that 24 bases are not sufficient to encode any product with function. Therefore some additional structural information about the claimed DNA molecules is required that cannot be found anywhere in the specification. The specification does not provide

Art Unit: 1652

any information about the critical bases comprised in SEQ ID NO:1 that must be retained in DNA molecules of claim 1 in order to encode a product with human kinase activity. No examples of such residues or DNA sequences comprising said residues are provided either. Current state of the art indicates that any DNA molecule which happens to comprise at least 24 bases of that capable of encoding a human kinase is not necessarily going to encode a product with a function similar to that human kinase.

Therefore due to lack of sufficient information and examples provided in the specification and due to unpredictability of prior art as to which of sequences embraced within the scope of claim 1 are capable of encoding a product with kinase function one of skill in the art has to go through the burden of undue experimentation in order to screen for those DNA molecules that are within the scope of this invention and as such the claim goes beyond the scope of the disclosure.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 1 is directed to a **genus** of DNA molecules, which have not been adequately described in the specification.

The specification does not contain any disclosure of the function of all DNA sequences that comprise at least 24 bases of SEQ ID NO:1. The genus of cDNAs that comprise these above cDNA molecules is a large variable genus with the potentiality of encoding many different proteins. Therefore, many functionally unrelated DNAs are encompassed within the scope of

Art Unit: 1652

these claims, including partial DNA sequences. The specification discloses only a **single species** of the claimed genus (namely SEQ ID NO:1) which is insufficient to put one of skill in the art in possession of the attributes and features of all species within the claimed genus. Therefore, one skilled in the art cannot reasonably conclude that the applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time the instant application was filed.

Applicant is referred to the revised interim guidelines concerning compliance with the written description requirement of U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, published in the Official Gazette and also available at www.uspto.gov.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase "first disclosed in the NHP polynucleotide described in SEQ ID NO:1" is indefinite. It is not clear if said sequence composition is changed or remains the same. Also the term "NHP polynucleotide" is unclear. Applicant is advised to avoid abbreviations when writing claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1652

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hillier et al. (EST Database, Accession No.W90174, Jul 1996). Hillier teaches a DNA sequence comprising 210 contiguous bases of SEQ ID NO:1 (see residues matching 1058-1268 of SEQ ID NO:1) prior to this invention, anticipating claim 1.

8.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 2-3 are allowed. This is because isolated DNA molecules encoding SEQ ID NO:2 are free of prior art. Further, the prior art does not teach or suggest preparing such specifically claimed DNA molecules. Hence said molecules are also non-obvious.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Maryam Monshipouri, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-1083.

The Examiner can normally be reached daily from 8:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Dr. P. Achutamurthy, can be reached at (703) 308-3804. The OFFICIAL fax number for Technology Center 1600 is (703) 308-4242.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 1600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

M. Monshi
MARYAM MONSHIPOURI, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER